UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/847,991	05/02/2001	Jason Seung-Min Kim	NVID-P003124	5788

45594   7590   08/26/2009

NVIDIA C/O MURABITO, HAO & BARNES LLP
TWO NORTH MARKET STREET
THIRD FLOOR
SAN JOSE, CA 95113

EXAMINER
MYERS, PAUL R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2111	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
08/26/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *22 June 2009*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.　　　2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *28,29,31-38 and 40-51* is/are pending in the application.

　　4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *28-29, 31-38, 40-51* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

　　Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

　　Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

　　a)☐ All　b)☐ Some *　c)☐ None of:

　　　1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

　　　2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

　　　3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

　　* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
　　Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
　　Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1.   Applicant's arguments filed 28-29, 31-38, 40-51 have been fully considered but they are

not persuasive.

In regards to applicants argument that Zucker et al does not teach the first communication

occurs simultaneously with the second communication: Zucker et al teaches separate paths.

Zucker et al's switch is a crosspoint switch that clearly would not block simultaneous

communication. Zucker et al also states that the operating system functions and user programs

are retrieved from memory and processed concurrently (Column 2 line 57 to Column 3 line 6).

And that conflict occurs when the processors try to access the same memory (as opposed to

different memories) at the same time (Column 11 line 28-43 and Column 10 line 41 to column

11 line 59). While this implies that processors concurrently access different memories at the

same time to concurrently process these functions/user programs. Zucker however does not

expressly state in a concise manner that simultaneous access to different memories is performed.

Even though the examiner cannot conceive that Zucker does not provide simultaneous access to

different memories (Zucker expressly blocks simultaneous accesses to the same memory) the

examiner cited Frankany et al that expressly taught separate data paths allowing concurrent

communications in parallel (Abstract, Column 2 lines 7-23 and Column 3 line 54 to Column 4

line 7).

In regards to applicants argument that Frankany fails to teach or suggest the first

communication occurs simultaneously with the second communication, that the cited section

recites simultaneous communication between two devices as opposed to the simultaneous

communication between at least four devices: The examiner notes the focus of Frankany is to

allow simultaneous bi-directional communication between two devices. Frankany also teaches

that the first data processor communicates with the first I/O device and the second processor

communicates with the first memory in parallel because each processor can be switched to a

unique path (Column 2 lines 7 to 23). Frankany teaches the first processor having simultaneous

bi-directional communication with the first I/O device while the second processor concurrently

has simultaneous bi-directional communication with the first memory.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

3.   Claims 28-29, 31-38, 40-51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Zucker et al PN 3,805,247 in view of Frankeny et al PN 5,949,982.

        In regards to claims 28, 31, 37, 40, 46, 48-50: Zucker et al teaches a system (Figure 8)

comprising: a plurality of memory resources (memories attached to 76); a plurality of peripheral

resources (Devices attached to 76); a plurality of processors (10); a memory controller (80, 84

and 86) coupled to said plurality of processors (10) and said plurality of memory resources

(memories attached to 76), wherein said memory controller comprises a first resource controller

(80) for controlling access of said plurality of processors (10) to said plurality of memory

resources (memories attached to 76), wherein said first resource controller (80) is further

operable to implement a first bus (connection from second processors middle item 70 to the

resource controllers OSN 84) for enabling first communication between a first processor (10) of

said plurality of processors and a first memory resource of said plurality of memory resources,

wherein said first resource controller (80) is further operable to implement a second bus

(connection from second processors middle item 70 to the resource controllers OSN 84) for

enabling second communication between a second processor (10) of said plurality of processors

and a second memory resource of said plurality of memory resources, and wherein said first

resource controller is further operable to implement said first and second buses for enabling said

first communication to occur independently of said second communication (the communications

are independent they are using different buses); and a peripheral controller (82, 84 and 86)

coupled to said plurality of processors and said plurality of peripheral resources, wherein said

peripheral controller comprises a second resource controller (82) for controlling access of said

plurality of processors to said plurality of peripheral resources, and wherein said first resource

controller is further operable to implement respective buses for coupling said plurality of

processors to said plurality of peripheral resources (84 and 86 are crossbar switches). Zucker

teaches preventing accessing to the same resource at the same time implying accessing of

different memories and different peripherals at the same time. (Column 11 line 28-43 and

Column 10 line 41 to column 11 line 59). Zucker however does not expressly state that

simultaneous access to different memories is performed. Frankeny expressly teaches

simultaneous communications to different resources (Abstract, (Column 2 lines 7 to 23)). It

would have been obvious to allow simultaneous communications to different resources in the

system of Zucker because this would have prevented stalling a processor to access a resource

that is not in use.

In regards to claims 29, 38: Zucker et al teaches a timer component (Clock 20 and 53)

coupled to the controllers to control timing of the controllers.

In regards to claims 32, 41: Zucker teaches the processors performing operations in

parallel.

In regards to claims 33, 42, 47: Zucker teaches a semaphore (Lock Column 12 lines 18-

32).

In regards to claims 34, 43: Zucker teaches the processors communicating through

crossbar switches to memories and devices via cross bar switches. Zucker however does not

expressly teach the processors being able to communicate with each other. Zucker does teach

them both being able to access the lock to determine if the other processor is accessing the

desired shared resource. Frankeny et al teaches a plurality of processors communicating to each

other and a plurality of memories and a plurality of I/O devices via a crossbar switch. It would

have been obvious to allow the processors to also communicate with each other because this

would have allowed for functions such as symmetrical multiprocessing.

In regards to claims 35, 44: Zucker teaches the priority scheme being round robin

(revolving priority Column 8 lines 11-21)

In regards to claims 36, 45 and 51: Zucker teaches the claimed computer system. Zucker

however does not teach the system is portable. Official notice is taken that portable computers

are well known. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of

the invention to include Zucker et al's design in a portable computer because this would have

made it portable.

Conclusion

4.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's

disclosure.

PN 5,327,548 to Hardell, Jr. et al is cited for teaching the purpose of a non blocking

crossbar switch is to allow all processors to concurrently communicate with global memory in all

but localized contention situations. (Column 3 lines 18-23)

5.   **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time

policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing

date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Paul R. Myers whose telephone number is 571 272 3639. The

examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thur 6:30-4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Mark Rinehart can be reached on (571) 272-3632. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would

like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated

information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

                                            Paul R. Myers
                                            Primary Examiner
                                            Art Unit 2111

/Paul R. Myers/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2111